

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed December 27, 2006 (Paper No. 20061129). Upon entry of this response, claims 1, 2, 4, 10-24, 55, 56, 58, and 72-247 are pending in the application. In this response, claims 1, 4, 10, and 55 have been amended, claims 236-247 have been added, and claims 3, 5-9, and 57 have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments being filed herewith be entered and request that there be reconsideration of all pending claims.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 20, 55, 57, 72, 160-161, 167, 171-174, 210-211, 214, 216-217, 220, 226, 230-231, and 234-235 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 20, 55, 57, 72, 160-161, 167, 171-174, 210-211, 214, 216-217, 220, 226, 230-231, and 234-235 have been rejected under §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581). To the extent that this rejection has not been rendered moot by claim cancellation, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See, e.g., *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

a. Claims 1 and 55

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “logic configured to store a first IP address assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device and used to manage the at least one RF cable interface; ...network address translation (NAT) logic configured to translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device to a second IP address having a subnet different than the first IP address.” Claim 55 has been amended to recite “storing a first IP address assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device and used to manage the RF cable interface...translating an IP address in

one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device to a second IP address having a subnet different than the first IP address.”

Edson discloses that “the firewall might also readdress out-going packets so that the packets appear to originate from a single address associated with the firewall 101.” Col. 9, lines 40-45. However, *Edson* does not disclose that this firewall address is “assigned by the RF cable data network to the RF cable network device and used to manage the RF cable interface” as recited in amended claims 1 and 55. Nor does *Edson* disclose the use of a second IP address “having a subnet different than the first IP address” as recited in amended claims 1 and 55.

For at least the reason that *Edson* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least these features, Applicant respectfully submits that *Edson* does not anticipate amended claims 1 and 55. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 55 be withdrawn.

b. Claims 72 and 210

Applicant respectfully submits that *Edson* fails to teach, disclose or suggest at least “logic configured to form at least one first IP datagram at least based upon the at least one first MAC frame, at least based upon the at least one IP address, and at least based upon the forward direction mapping, the at least one first IP datagram comprising a source IP address field, the at least one IP address being placed into the source IP address field of the at least one first IP datagram...logic configured to form at least one second medium access control (MAC) frame at least based upon the at least one second IP datagram, at least based upon the at least one IP address, and at least based upon the reverse direction mapping” as recited in claim 72. *Edson* also fails to teach, disclose or suggest at least “forming at least one first IP datagram at least based upon the at least one first MAC frame, at least based upon the at least one IP address, and at least based upon the forward direction mapping, the at least one first IP datagram comprising a source IP address field, the at least one IP address being placed into the source IP address field of the at least one first IP datagram...forming at least one second

medium access control (MAC) frame at least based upon the at least one second IP datagram, at least based upon the at least one IP address, and at least based upon the reverse direction mapping” as recited in claim 210.

The Office Action does not indicate what specific teachings in *Edson* correspond to these features. Instead, the Office Action makes a conclusory allegation that “it is common to use media access control [MAC], when dealing with networking. The MAC controls how devices communicate with the physical medium and normally direct digital data to the various devices; see fig. 3 and cols. 11 and 12, lines 41067 and 1-14.” Applicant notes that the cited passage in *Edson* merely describes the function of a MAC layer and an operating system layer. *Edson* does not disclose the specific features listed above and recited in claims 72 and 210. Therefore, if this rejection is maintained in the next Office Action, the Examiner is requested to point out with particularity the portion of *Edson* that teaches these features.

For at least the reason that *Edson* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest these features, Applicant respectfully submits that *Edson* does not anticipate claims 72 and 210. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 72 and 210 be withdrawn.

c. Claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, and 57

Claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, and 57 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of these claims is therefore rendered moot. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public. Applicant expressly reserves the right to present cancelled claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, and 57, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequent to the present application.

d. Claims 2, 8, 20, 160-161, 167, 171-174, 211, 214, 216-217, 220, 226, 230-231, and 234-235

Since independent claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 8, 20, 160-161, 167, 171-174, 211, 214, 216-217, 220, 226, 230-231, and 234-235 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 8, 20, 160-161, 167, 171-174, 211, 214, 216-217, 220, 226, 230-231, and 234-235 be withdrawn.

2. Rejection of Claims 7 and 172 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7 and 172 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Fan* (6,219,706). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 7 has been rendered moot by claim cancellation. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of this cancelled claim in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public. Applicant expressly reserves the right to present cancelled claim 7, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequent to the present application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 172. The addition of *Fan* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claim 172 is considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 172 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 172 be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 4, 74-79, 127-128, and 212-213 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 74-79, 127-128, and 212-213 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (2005/0028206). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claims 1, 72, and 210. Therefore, claims 4, 74-79, 127-128, and 212-213 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claims 1, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 74-79, 127-128, and 212-213 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 4, 74-79, 127-128, and 212-213 be withdrawn.

4. Rejection of Claims 10-12 and 177 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10-12 and 177 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Na* (6,993,785). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Na* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 72. Therefore, claims 10-12 and 177 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claims 1 and 72 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12 and 177 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10-12 and 177 be withdrawn.

5. Rejection of Claims 13-16, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 58, 162-164, 166, 170, 222-225, 227, and 229 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13-16, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 58, 162-164, 166, 170, 222-225, 227, and 229 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Nazarathy*

(6,490,727). The addition of *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, claims 13-16, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 58, 162-164, 166, 170, 222-225, 227, and 229 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-16, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 58, 162-164, 166, 170, 222-225, 227, and 229 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 13-16, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 58, 162-164, 166, 170, 222-225, 227, and 229 be withdrawn.

6. Rejection of Claims 17, 22, 165, 169, and 228 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 17, 22, 165, 169, and 228 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Nazarathy* (6,490,727) and *Cameron* (2005/0028206). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Nazarathy* and *Cameron* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claims 1, 72, and 210. Therefore, claims 17, 22, 165, 169, and 228 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claims 1, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17, 22, 165, 169, and 228 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 17, 22, 165, 169, and 228 be withdrawn.

7. Rejection of Claims 80-90 and 130-137 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 80-90 and 130-137 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (2005/0028206) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore,

claims 80-90 and 130-137 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 80-90 and 130-137 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 80-90 and 130-137 be withdrawn.

8. Rejection of Claims 93-94, 104-106, and 116-117 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 93-94, 104-106, and 116-117 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (2005/0028206) and *Hooper* (5,414,455). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Hooper* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 93-94, 104-106, and 116-117 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 93-94, 104-106, and 116-117 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 93-94, 104-106, and 116-117 be withdrawn.

9. Rejection of Claims 95-103, 107-115, and 118-126 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 95-103, 107-115, and 118-126 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (2005/0028206) and *Hooper* (5,414,455) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Hooper* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 95-103, 107-115, and 118-126 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 95-103, 107-115,

and 118-126 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 95-103, 107-115, and 118-126 be withdrawn.

10. Rejection of Claim 129 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 129 has been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* and *Bowser* (6,870,570). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Bowser* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claim 129 is considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 129 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 129 be withdrawn.

11. Rejection of Claim 139 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 139 has been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (2005/0028206) and *Okano* (2002/0062485). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Okano* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claim 139 is considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 139 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 139 be withdrawn.

12. Rejection of Claims 140-148 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 140-148 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (2005/0028206) and *Okano* (2002/0062485) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Okano* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 140-148 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 140-148 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 140-148 be withdrawn.

13. Rejection of Claims 149-150 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 149-150 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (2005/0028206) and *Na* (6,993,785). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and *Na* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 149-150 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 149-150 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 149-150 be withdrawn.

14. Rejection of Claims 151-159 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 151-159 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (2005/0028206) and *Na* (6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Cameron* and

Nazarathy does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 151-159 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 151-159 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 151-159 be withdrawn.

15. Rejection of Claims 175-176 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 175-176 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Tseng* (5,582,714). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Tseng* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 175-176 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 175-176 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 175-176 be withdrawn.

16. Rejection of Claims 178-180, 182-184, and 186 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 178-180, 182-184, and 186 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Na* (6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Na* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 178-180, 182-184, and 186 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 178-180, 182-184, and 186 are allowable for at least the reason that each

depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 178-180, 182-184, and 186 be withdrawn.

17. Rejection of Claims 181 and 185 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 181 and 185 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Na* (6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727) and *Cameron* (2005/0028206). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Na*, *Nazarathy*, and *Cameron* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 181 and 185 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 181 and 185 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 181 and 185 be withdrawn

18. Rejection of Claims 187-188, 198-199, and 215 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 187-188, 198-199, and 215 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (6,487,592). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 187-188, 198-199, and 215 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claims 72 and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 187-188, 198-199, and 215 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 187-188, 198-199, and 215 be withdrawn

19. Rejection of Claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (6,487,592) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 be withdrawn

20. Rejection of Claims 192 and 196 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 192 and 196 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (6,487,592) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727) and *Cameron* (2005/0028206). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer*, *Nazarathy*, and *Sawyer* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 192 and 196 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 192 and 196 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 192 and 196 be withdrawn

21. Rejection of Claim 200 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 200 has been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (6,487,592) and *Na* (6,993,785). Applicant respectfully traverses

this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Na* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claim 200 is considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 200 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 200 be withdrawn.

22. Rejection of Claims 201-203, 205-207, and 209 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 201-203, 205-207, and 209 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (6,487,592) and *Na* (6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer*, *Na*, and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 201-203, 205-207, and 209 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 201-203, 205-207, and 209 is allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 201-203, 205-207, and 209 be withdrawn.

23. Rejection of Claims 204 and 208 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 204 and 208 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Sawyer* (6,487,592) and *Na* (6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727) and *Cameron* (2005/0028206). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer*, *Na*, *Nazarathy*, and *Cameron* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 204 and 208 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim

72 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 204 and 208 is allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 204 and 208 be withdrawn.

24. Rejection of Claims 218-219 and 232-233 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 218-219 and 232-233 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Okano* (2002/0062485). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Okano* does not cure the deficiencies of *Edson* discussed above in connection with independent claim 72. Therefore, claims 218-219 and 232-233 are considered patentable under any combination of these references. Furthermore, since independent claim 210 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 218-219 and 232-233 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 218-219 and 232-233 be withdrawn.

25. Newly Added Claims

Applicant submits that new claims 236-247 are allowable over the cited references. Dependent claims 236-247 are allowable over the cited references for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to enter and allow the above new claims.

26. Assertions that Certain Features Are Well-Known

The Office Action includes the following assertions that features are “well-known”, “common”, “commonly used”, “widely known”, or “industry accepted”:

- (p. 16, rejecting claims 13, 16, 21, 58, 164, 168, 224, and 227) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DOCSIS compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson so that the resulting device would be compatible with a **well known** standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 17, rejecting claims 14, 162, and 222) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the set-top box capabilities of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson so that the resulting device would also provide common set-top box functionality for the end user.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 17, rejecting claims 18, 23, 166, 170, 225, and 229) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DAVIC compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson so that the resulting device would be compatible with the a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 20, rejecting claims 80 and 130) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the set-top box capabilities of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Cameron so that the resulting device would also provide common set-top box functionality for the end user.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 21, rejecting claims 84, 89, 134, and 138) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DAVIC compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Cameron so that the resulting device would be compatible with the a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 22, rejecting claim 93) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the time-division multiplexing of Hooper, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Cameron so that the resulting device could use a well known technique to increase the data traffic of the network.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 22, rejecting claim 104) “[F]requency division is well known in the cable art and is commonly used along with time division.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 22, rejecting claim 104) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the frequency-division multiplexing of Hooper, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Cameron so that the resulting device could use a well known technique to increase the data traffic of the network.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 25, rejecting claims 95, 107, and 118) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the set-top box capabilities of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson, Cameron, and Hooper so that the resulting device would also provide common set-top box functionality for the end user.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 26, rejecting claims 99, 103, 111, 115, 122, and 126) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DAVIC compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to

the device of Edson, Cameron, and Hooper so that the resulting device would be compatible with the a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.

- (p. 27, rejecting claim 129) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the Bluetooth networking of Bowser, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Cameron to allow wireless networking with an industry accepted standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 27, rejecting claim 139) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the use of DHCP as done in Okano, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Cameron to take advantage of a widely known standard for dynamically allocating IP addresses on a network.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 30, rejecting claims 144 and 148) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DAVIC compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson, Cameron, and Okano so that the resulting device would be compatible with the a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 32, rejecting claim 151) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the set-top box capabilities of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson, Cameron, and Na so that the resulting device would also provide common set-top box functionality for the end user.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 33, rejecting claims 155 and 159) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DAVIC compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson, Cameron, and Na so that the resulting device would be compatible with the a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 35, rejecting claim 178) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the set-top box capabilities of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Na so that the resulting device would also provide common set-top box functionality for the end user.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 36, rejecting claims 182 and 186) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DOCSIS compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson so that the resulting device would be compatible with a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 40, rejecting claim 189) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the set-top box capabilities of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Sawyer so that the resulting device would also provide common set-top box functionality for the end user.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 40, rejecting claims 191 and 195) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DOCSIS compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson so that the resulting device would be compatible with a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 41, rejecting claims 193 and 195) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DAVIC compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson so that the resulting device would be compatible with the a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 44, rejecting claim 201) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the set-top box capabilities of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson, Sawyer, and Na so that the resulting device would also provide common set-top box functionality for the end user.” Emphasis Added.

- (p. 44, rejecting claims 203 and 207) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DOCSIS compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson so that the resulting device would be compatible with a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 44, rejecting claims 205 and 209) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the DAVIC compatibility of Nazarathy, an analogous art, to the device of Edson so that the resulting device would be compatible with the a well known standard.” Emphasis Added.
- (p. 47, rejecting claim 218) “[I]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the use of DHCP as done in Okano, an analogous art, to the device of Edson and Cameron to take advantage of a widely known standard for dynamically allocating IP addresses on a network.” Emphasis Added.

Applicant respectfully submits that in the context of the claim language, such an assertion that these features are “well-known”, “widely known”, “common”, “commonly used”, or “industry accepted” is improper, given the added complexity associated with such features incorporated from independent claims 1, 55, 72, and 210, and the balance of the claim features found in the dependent rejected claims referred to above. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the assertion.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims 1-2, 4, 10-24, 55-56, 58, and 72-247 be allowed to issue. Any statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Karen G. Hazzah/

Karen G. Hazzah, Reg. No. 48,472

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

100 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933